



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/992,516	11/14/2001	David A. Shafer	D6431 8007		
7590 05/04/2004			EXAMINER		
Benjamin Aaron Adler ADLER & ASSOCIATES			WESSENDORF, TERESA D		
8011 Candle Lane			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Houston, TX	77071		1639		
			DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/992,516	SHAFER, DAVID A.	
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	T. D. Wessendorf	1639	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	_
THE REPLY FILED 01 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to an places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	-		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) Ithey are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s): <u>none</u> .		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment	
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: of t			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• •		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: 7 and 9-22.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-6, 8 and	<u>23-54</u> .		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:		4 -	
		T.D. Wessendorf	
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1639	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the proposed amendments would require further consideration and/or search. Applicants state that the examiner contends that the as-filed specification teaches center-to-center spacing of about 1 mm to about 3 mm. Contrary, to applicants' assertion the examiner contend that the center-to-center is in the range of 1-3 mm. and not about 1. Since applicant has not pointed out support for the newly amended claim hence, the rejections under 112 and prior art have not been overcome.